



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/468,614	12/21/1999	ALOK SINHA	042390.P7752	3838

7590 10/24/2002

ALOYSIUS T C AUYEUNG  
BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP  
12400 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD 7TH FLOOR  
LOS ANGELES, CA 90025

EXAMINER

CAO, DIEM K

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2126

DATE MAILED: 10/24/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/468,614

Applicant(s)

SINHA ET AL.

Examiner

Diem K Cao

Art Unit

2151

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 December 1999.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 21 December 1999 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 2) ☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_ 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is in response to application filed on 12/21/1999

2. Claims 1-28 are presented for examination.

#### *Drawings*

3. The drawings filed on 12/21/1999 are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference sign(s) mentioned in the description: Figure 1, reference numbers 10 and 16. A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

4. The drawings filed on 12/21/1999 are acceptable subject to correction of the informalities indicated on the attached "Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review," PTO-948. In order to avoid abandonment of this application, correction is required in reply to the Office Action. The correction will not be held in abeyance.

#### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 10-11, 13-14, 16, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hinckley (U.S. 5,828,882) in view of Topff et al.(U.S. 6,026,500).

As to claim 10, Hinckley teaches (col. 4, lines 39-67) registering (registration request 102) the application (program 104) with a programming interface (program-interface 112), upon occurrence of the event (event 110 occurs), notifying the application (call 106 to the handler routine 108 of the program). However, Hinckley does not teach the event is a hardware event. Topff teaches upon occurrence of the hardware event (event signal 545; col. 3, line 36 – col. 4, line 39 and Fig. 1), notifying the application (transmitted from ... to a help desk application program; col. 4, lines 4-39). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the teaching of Topff to the system of Hinckley because it would provide Hinckley system a method to monitor and process the hardware event without delay (col. 2, lines 13-42).

As to claim 11, Hinckley teaches (col. 4, lines 39-56) allocating a data storage location (registrations repository 114), and storing (storing) data (information) in the data storage location.

As to claim 13, Hinckley as modified by Topff teaches storing data identifying the hardware event (Each entry of the event table 200 corresponds to a type of event 110; col. 4, lines 60-65).

As to claim 14, Hinckley as modified by Topff does not explicitly teach storing a hardware identification value that identifies a storage medium associated with the event. Hinckley as modified teaches storing data identifying the hardware event (Each entry of the event table 200 corresponds to a type of event 110; col. 4, lines 60-65). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that the system of Hinckley would have to store the hardware identification value that identifies a storage medium

Art Unit: 2126

because the application would need information related to the event in order to process that event (col. 9, lines 39-50).

**As to claim 16**, Hinckley teaches notifying the application includes providing a callback function (handler routine; col. 4, lines 51-56).

**As to claim 22**, Hinckley teaches (col. 4, lines 39-56) indicating the occurrence of an event (event 110 occurs) from a programming interface (event manager 118) to a management application (a procedure call ... of the program). Hinckley does not explicitly teach a processor, a medium for storing instructions, and a medium for storing data. However, the instructions (event notification facility) are executed in a computer. Inherently, a processor, a medium for storing instructions, and a medium for storing data must be included in the computer. Hinckley does not explicitly teach the event with the medium for storing data. Topff teaches upon occurrence of the hardware event (event signal 545; col. 3, line 36 – col. 4, line 39 and Fig. 1), notifying the application (transmitted from ... to a help desk application program; col. 4, lines 4-39). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the teaching of Topff to the system of Hinckley because it would provide Hinckley system a technique to process the problem of the hardware event (col. 2, lines 13-42).

7. Claims 1-2, 4-7, 9, 15, 17, 19-20, 23-24 and 26-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hinckley in view of Topff et al. further in view of Corrington et al. (U.S. 6,076,142).

**As to claim 1**, Hinckley teaches (col. 4, lines 39-56) registering (registration request 102) the management application (program 104) with an event application programming interface (event notification facility 100 includes a program interface 102), detecting occurrence of an

Art Unit: 2126

event (event detection hardware and/or software), notifying the management application of the event via the event application programming interface (event manager perform ... of the program). However, Hinckley does not teach detecting occurrence of an event from a RAID with the RAID monitor service. Corrington teaches (col. 11, line 41 – col. 12, line 13) detecting (monitor) occurrence of an event from a RAID (status and failures of the components) with the RAID monitor service (ICU Module and Monitor Utility). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the teaching of Corrington to the system of Hinckley because it would provide the user the options to check and correct the RAID system events (col. 2, lines 38-63).

As to claim 2, Hinckley as modified by Corrington teaches (col. 4, lines 39-56) updating the event application programming interface (When an event 110 occurs, ... to an event manager 118) with the RAID monitor service upon occurrence of the event (event interface 116 connected to event detection hardware and/of software).

As to claim 4, Hinckley teaches registering the management application includes identifying the type of event (Each entry of an event table ... type of event 110; col. 4, lines 39-56).

As to claim 5, Hinckley teaches registering the management application includes providing the event application programming interface with a callback function (handler routine; col. 4, line 39 – col. 5, line 17).

As to claim 6, Hinckley teaches (col. 4, lines 39-56) the event application programming interface (event manager 118) use the callback function to (handler routine 108) notify the management application (program 104) of the occurrence of the event (event 110 occurs).

Art Unit: 2126

As to claim 7, Hinckley as modified by Corrington teaches (col. 4, lines 39-56) creating an interprocess communication between the RAID monitor service and the management application (The event notification facility 100 includes a program interface 112 ... connected to event detection hardware and/or software).

As to claim 9, Hinckley teaches (col. 4, lines 39-56) the event application programming interface (event notification facility 100, event manager 118) returns (performs a procedure call) a callback function (handler routine 108) upon notification of the event (when an event 110 occurs).

As to claim 15, Hinckley teaches notifying the programming interface of the occurrence of the event with a monitor (event manager perform ... of the program; col. 4, lines 39-56). However, Hinckley does not teach detecting occurrence of an event from a RAID with the RAID monitor service. Corrington teaches (col. 11, lines 41 – col. 12, lines 13) detecting (monitor) occurrence of a hardware event from a RAID (status and failures of the driver) with the RAID monitor service (ICU Module and Monitor Utility). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the teaching of Corrington to the system of Hinckley because it would provide the user a method to check and correct the RAID system events (col. 2, lines 38-63).

As to claim 17, it is the same as the method of claim 1 except it is a computer product claim.

As to claim 19, Hinckley as modified by Corrington teaches notify the management application of a hardware event (When an event occurs ... the program; col. 4, lines 39-56).

Art Unit: 2126

As to claim 20, Hinckley does not explicitly teach the hardware event is selected from the group consisting of a disk drive failure, disk drive initialization, array migration, and data recovery. Corrington teaches (col. 5, line 9 – col. 6, line 65) the hardware event is selected from a group consisting of a disk drive failure (drive module failure occurs), disk drive initialization (create RAID set), array migration (designate spare drives), and data recovery (rebuild failed drive). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the teaching of Corrington to the system of Hinckley so it can monitor and process the status of the RAID system (col. 5, lines 60-67).

As to claim 23, Hinckley does not explicitly teach the management application is selected from the group consisting of a desktop management program, a RAID system management application, and a RAID monitor application. Topff teaches the management application is a desktop management program. Corrington teaches a RAID monitor application. It is obvious there are many programs to monitor the RAID system and any of them could work with the system of Hinckley.

As to claim 24, Hinckley does not explicitly teach a RAID monitor service. Corrington teaches a RAID monitor service (ICU Module and Monitor Utility; col. 11, line 41 – col. 12, line 13). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the teaching of Corrington to the system of Hinckley because it provide Hinckley's system a better monitor service for RAID system.

As to claim 26, it is the same as the method of claim 1 except it is an apparatus claim.

As to **claim 27**, Hinckley teaches (col. 4, lines 39-56) registering (registration request 102) the management application (program 104) with an event application programming interface (event notification facility 100 includes a program interface 102).

As to **claim 28**, Hinckley teaches (col. 4, line 39 – col. 5, line 40) instructions that cause the processor to provide the function of the event programming interface (The event notification ... connected to event detection hardware and/or software).

As to **claim 3**, Hinckley does not explicitly teach registering includes identifying a storage medium associated with the event. Topff teaches upon occurrence of the hardware event (event signal 545; col. 3, line 36- col. 4, line 39 and Fig. 1), notifying the application (transmitted from ... to a help desk application program; col. 4, lines 4-39). It would have been obvious to apply the teaching of Topff to monitor the hardware event to the system of Hinckley because Hinckley's system would have to store the hardware identification value that identifies a storage medium because the application would need information related to the hardware event in order to monitor or process that event (col. 9, lines 39-50).

8. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hinckley in view of Topff et al. further in view of Solomon et al. (U.S. 5,305,326).

As to **claim 12**, Hinckley as modified by Topff does not teach storing data identifying an input/output processor. Solomon teaches a RAID system utilizes an I/O processor for controlling the overall system (col. 2, lines 23-57). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the teaching of Solomon to the system of Hinckley to monitor the I/O processor because it would provided an improved techniques for handling any failure condition of the RAID system.

Art Unit: 2126

9. Claims 21, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hinckley in view of Topff et al. and Corringtong et al. further in view of Solomon et al. (U.S. 5,305,326).

As to claim 21, refer to claim 12 above for rejection.

As to claim 25, Hinckley as modified by Topff does not explicitly teach comprising an intelligent input/output controller. Solomon discloses Patterson et al. teaches RAID system uses an intelligent input/output processor (col. 1, lines 13-33). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the teaching of Patterson to the system of Hinckley because it would provide an effective way to accessing data in the RAID system (col. 1, lines 23-29).

10. Claims 8 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hinckley in view of Topff et al. and Corringtong et al. further in view of Skarbo et al. (U.S. 5,805,886).

As to claims 8 and 18, Hinckley does not explicitly teach unregistering the management application with the event application programming interface. Skarbo teaches (col. 7, lines 40-45) unregistering (unregister) the management application (communication application) with the event application programming interface (address book). It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art to apply the teaching of Skarbo to the system of Hinckley because it would provide the management application a way to unregister itself when it doesn't interesting in event notification.

Art Unit: 2126

*Conclusion*

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Diem K Cao whose telephone number is (703) 305-5220. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 9:00AM - 5:00PM.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

**Any response to this action should be mailed to:**

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks  
Washington, DC 20231

**Or fax to:**

- AFTER-FINAL faxes must be signed and sent to (703) 746-7238.
- OFFICIAL faxes must be signed and sent to (703) 746-7239.
- NON-OFFICIAL/DRAFT faxes should not be signed, please send to (703) 746-7140.

Diem Cao  
October 21, 2002



ALVIN OBERLEY  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100